

after 20 years. These are all great benefits, but these are very expensive. These benefits are not going to do what the proponents said they're supposed to do. They're not going to retain people. We do not need recruitment incentive, therefore, I think at this time it would be in keeping with the fiscal responsible nature that this body has set upon itself this session, under the able leadership of the Appropriations Committee, to go ahead and accept this amendment, and keep this in line with the other state employees in the State of Nebraska.

PRESIDENT: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. Senator Dworak says that the arguments that I offered several days ago are not valid. They're not valid in his estimation. That is as far as it goes. It's his opinion against mine. He says that you can't tell, I'm not going to argue about the recruitment. The fact that you get 400 people to sign up for 30 or 40 jobs doesn't mean anything. It's not exactly what you get that wants the job, it's how many you keep of those you hire. What I said the other day was that once you have hired an individual, and once you have placed him in training, and once you have invested \$22,000 in him then it behooves us, if we're going to be fiscally prudent, and Senator Dworak makes a big fuss about it, but that fiscal prudence extends then to trying to keep that individual. I'm not going to stand here and act as though I'm an expert on what it takes to keep a man in the Highway Patrol. My experience with the Patrol has been that they have had a high rate of, I guess you would call it involuntary retirement, people who have quit, flat out quit for a variety of reasons. I do not know, nor does Senator Dworak know, whether this proposal offered by the Retirement Committee is going to stop any of that. I believe that it might. The thing that I'm talking about is that Senator Dworak is lamenting the fact that way down the road, after 30 years, you might find a man who quits a year or two before he is 55. I would just like to suggest that if an individual is 55, or if an individual has worked for the Highway Patrol for 30 years he must have put in a lot of time, he put in a lot of overtime, he put in a lot of hazardous duty. It's not the kind of job that you can sit at a desk, Senator Dworak, and write an insurance policy, or buy feed, or sell cattle, and I've done it all. It is not the kind of a job that you can handle if you're not completely alert, if you're not on top of the job every day. So, as Senator Luedtke pointed out, what happens is if an individual gets to that point, and some of us do, some of us are approaching it at this time, our eyesight is not as good, our reflexes are not as good, hearing is not as good. Senator Clark is at that point already. The point is this, what do you do with the guy? You keep him on the job, you give him a desk job. Some of these men make good administrative officers and some do not. They are the first to concede that point. But if you're going to force a man to stay on the job and shuffle papers, you're going to have to find a place for him. If you find that place for him you pay him at a higher rate. You talk about the \$2 million responsibility, or the \$2 million liability that Senator Dworak is talking about, I would not know, nor does Senator Dworak know, what the liability might be to the state in regard to an employee who is kept on simply because he is not eligible for retirement, he's been a loyal employee for 30 years, he can't perform the job that he would like to perform as a traffic officer, and so you keep him on the job at a